

(3)+(4) The third and fourth definitions are not correct because the Buddha accords with the third and fourth definitions but is neither a truth of cessation nor a truth of the path. The Buddha accords with the third and the fourth definitions because he possesses those eight aspects. He possesses the aspect of cessation, etc. because he obtained the cessation of afflictive and cognitive obstructions. Further, he possesses the aspect of a path, etc. because he is endowed with the Mahayana path of no more learning, i.e. the omniscient mind.

- Someone says: "(1) The definition of the truth of suffering is '*a truth that is an aspect of thorough affliction and that is explained in the sutras to be similar to a disease in that it is to be known by those who aspire to liberation*', (2) the definition of the truth of origin is '*a truth that is an aspect of thorough affliction and that is explained in the sutras to be similar to the cause of a disease in that it is to be abandoned by those who aspire to liberation*', (3) the definition of the truth of cessation is '*a truth that is a purified aspect and that is explained in the sutras to be similar to the separation from a disease in that it is to be actualized by those who aspire to liberation*', and (4) the definition of the truth of the path is '*a truth that is a purified aspect and that is explained in the sutras to be similar to the remedy for a disease in that it is to be cultivated by those who aspire to liberation*'."

(1) The first definition is not correct because the contaminated physical aggregates in the continua of Arhats abiding in the Nirvana of a remainder are truths of the path but they do not accord with the first definition. The contaminated physical aggregates in the continua of Arhats abiding in the Nirvana with remainder are truths of the path because Arhats who abide in the Nirvana with remainder still possess truths of the path. Arhats who abide in the Nirvana with remainder still possess truths of the path because they still have karma that is subsumed under cyclic existence in their continua. Arhats who abide in the Nirvana with remainder have karma that is subsumed under cyclic existence in their continua because they dwell in cyclic existence through the force of karma. They dwell in cyclic existence through the force of karma because they still have the contaminated physical aggregates.

However, the contaminated physical aggregates in the continua of Arhats abiding in the Nirvana of a remainder are not in accord with the definition because they are not *truths that are aspects of thorough affliction*. The contaminated physical aggregates in the continua of Arhats abiding in the Nirvana of a remainder are not *truths that are aspects of thorough affliction* because Arhats do not have *truths that are aspects of thorough affliction* in their continua. Arhats do not have *truths that are aspects of thorough affliction* in their continua because they have completely eliminated afflictive obstructions.

Furthermore, the first definition is not correct because a *faith faculty* that is a truth of suffering exists and because such a faith faculty is not *a truth that is an aspect of thorough affliction*. A *faith faculty* that is a truth of suffering is not *a truth that is an aspect of thorough affliction* because it is a truth that is a purified aspect. It is a truth that is a purified aspect because it is a purified faculty. A *faith faculty* that is a truth of suffering is a purified faculty because it is a faith faculty.

Moreover, a *faith faculty* that is a truth of suffering exists because a *faith faculty* that is associated with a main mind which is a virtuous projecting karma exists. A *faith faculty* that is associated with a main mind which is a virtuous projecting karma exists because a main mind that is a virtuous projecting karma must be associated with a faith faculty. A faith faculty that is associated with a main mind which is a virtuous projecting karma must be associated with a faith faculty because it is virtuous main mind, and because whatever is a virtuous mind is necessarily concomitant with faith. Whatever is a virtuous mind is necessarily concomitant with faith because whatever is a virtuous mind is necessarily concomitant with ten mental factors (that include faith). Whatever is a virtuous mind is necessarily concomitant with ten mental factors because Vasubhandhu says in his ***Abhidharmakosha (Treasure of Knowledge)***:

*Faith, conscientiousness, pliancy,
Equanimity, shame, consideration,
The two roots (non-attachment and non-hatred), non-harmfulness, and
Effort always arise with the virtuous.*

- (2) The second definition is not correct because projecting karma that determines rebirth as a *Brahma type* (*Brahma type* is the first of the seventeen regions of the form realm) is a truth of origin but it does not accord with the second definition. Projecting karma that determines rebirth as a Brahma type is a truth of origin because it is immovable projecting karma that is subsumed under cyclic existence.

However, projecting karma that determines rebirth as a Brahma type does not accord with the second definition because it is not *to be abandoned by those who aspire to liberation*. It is not *to be abandoned by those who aspire to liberation* because it is not an object of abandonment. Projecting karma that determines rebirth as a Brahma type is not an object of abandonment because it is virtuous. It is virtuous because it is immovable karma.

- Someone says: "The truth of suffering and the truth of origin are equivalent."

That is not correct because the impure worldly environment is a truth of suffering but not a truth of origin. The impure worldly environment is a truth of suffering because that was previously established. However, it is not a truth of origin because it is not karma, a delusion, or a physical aggregate etc. that is a truth of origin.

- Someone says: "A Hearer who is on the path of meditation and who will attain Nirvana in this lifetime is a Samsaric being because he dwells in Samsara."

There is no pervasion, i.e. whoever dwells in Samsara is not necessarily a Samsaric being. Otherwise it would absurdly follow that a Hearer Arhat who abides in the Nirvana with remainder is a Samsaric being because he dwells in Samsara.

- Someone says: "A Hearer who is on the path of meditation and who will attain Nirvana in this lifetime is not a truth of suffering because he is a Sangha Jewel. Whoever is a Sangha jewel is necessarily not a truth of suffering because whatever is a Dharma jewel is necessarily not a truth of suffering."

Even though we agree that whatever is a Dharma Jewel is necessarily not a truth of suffering, we do not agree that whoever is a Sangha Jewel is necessarily not a truth of suffering. Therefore, a Hearer who is on the path of meditation and who will attain Nirvana in this lifetime is both a Sangha Jewel and a truth of suffering.

In dependence on refuting the different definitions of the truth of suffering we can determine that whatever is a truth of suffering is not necessarily suffering because whatever is suffering is necessarily a mental factor. Whatever is suffering is necessarily a mental factor because whatever is suffering is necessarily the feeling of suffering.

Furthermore, whatever is a truth of suffering is not necessarily suffering because whatever is pervasive compositional suffering is not necessarily suffering. Whatever is pervasive compositional suffering is not necessarily suffering because the contaminated five aggregates are pervasive compositional suffering but they are not suffering.

The contaminated five aggregates are pervasive compositional suffering because Dharmakirti says in his ***Pramanavartika (Commentary of the 'Compendium of Valid Cognition')***:

The aggregates are endowed with the cycle of suffering

Moreover, the contaminated five aggregates are not suffering because they are not the feeling of suffering.

- Someone says: "The truth of suffering and the truth of origin are contradictory."

This is not correct because whatever is a truth of origin is necessarily a truth of suffering. Whatever is a truth of origin is necessarily a truth of suffering because whatever is a karmic truth of suffering is necessarily a truth of origin and because whatever is a delusional truth of origin is necessarily a truth of suffering.